

11th March 1958]

APPENDIX IV.

[Vide item No. V on page 96 supra.]

REPORT OF THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE
MADRAS PROHIBITION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1958
(L.A. BILL No. 2 OF 1958).

To

THE HON. THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
MADRAS.

The Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1958 (L.A. Bill No. 2 of 1958), has the honour to make the following report.

2. The Bill was published in English in Part IV-A of the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated 13th February 1958, and in Tamil in the *Fort St. George Gazette*, dated the 26th February 1958.

3. The Joint Select Committee was appointed by resolutions of the Assembly, dated the 14th February 1958, and at the Council, dated the 15th February 1958.

4. The Joint Select Committee met in the Legislators' Lounge Room, Fort St. George, Madras, at 11 a.m. on Friday, the 28th February 1958, and in the Committee Room, Old Legislators' Hostel, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at 10 a.m. on Thursday, the 6th March 1958 and at 10 a.m. on Friday, the 7th March 1958.

5. At its first meeting on the 28th February 1958, the Hon. Sri M. Bhaktavatsalam was elected as Chairman of the Joint Select Committee.

6. The Committee has discussed the principles underlying the Bill and also scrutinised the clauses of the Bill in detail and has as a result made certain changes in them. Some of the important changes are mentioned below :—

Clause 3.

This clause provides for certain changes in the definitions in section 3 of the principal Act, one of which is the substitution of 'Neera or padani' for 'Sweet Toddy'. The intention was to permit the sale of neera or padani as long as it was not fermented when it became toddy. The words 'and not fermented' have therefore been added at the end of the definition in item (11-B). The Committee consequently decided to delete the words 'or neera or padani' occurring in the definition of the word 'toddy' and to retain the definition of 'toddy' as it stood at present in the original Act.

Clause 7.

The Committee felt that the clause required improvement with reference to the minimum quantity of molasses that could be possessed by any person and other matters. But in order to avoid

[11th March 1958]

delay in the passing of the Act the clause as introduced was accepted with the assurance that it would be amended later on if necessary in the light of the suggestions of the Members and the examination by the Department.

Clause 10 (new section 15-A).

The principle was accepted that summary trials were necessary to avoid unnecessary expenditure but it was at the same time considered that this should not apply to offences for which the punishment was imprisonment. The clause has therefore been amended so as to provide that as a result of summary trials only fines could be imposed.

Clause 14.

This clause originally provided for the constitution of Prohibition Committees in such areas as the Government may determine instead of at every taluk as at present. It has been amended so as to enable the Government to constitute a State Committee for the whole State and the Collectors to form District Committees in respect of such areas as may be specified by the Government.

Clause 17.

This clause had been introduced on the recommendation of the Prohibition Enquiry Committee but the Committee felt that the posting of additional police which involves collection of fine from the villagers would lead to harassment of villagers who had nothing to do with the offence. The Committee finally agreed by majority vote to delete the clause. The clause was accordingly deleted.

7. The Committee also resolved that section 54 of the Act may be amended so as to provide that the rules to be framed under the Act, should be laid on the Table of both the Houses and should be subject to such changes as the Legislative Assembly may make.

8. The Committee decided that the changes made by it were not of such important character as to require the republication of the Bill.

9. Some of the members of the Committee have given dissenting minutes which are appended.

10. A copy of the Bill as amended by the Joint Select Committee is annexed.

M. BHAKTAVATSALAM,
Chairman.

FORT ST. GEORGE, MADRAS-9.
8th March 1958.

11th March 1958]

ANNEXURE.

NOTE.—The changes made are sidelined or underlined and the portions omitted are indicated by dots.

L.A. BILL No. 2 OF 1958.

A Bill further to amend the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937.

WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937 (Madras Act X of 1937), for the purposes hereinafter appearing;

BE it enacted in the Ninth Year of the Republic of India as follows :—

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) This Act may be called the Madras Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 1958.

(2) It shall come into force in any local area in the State of Madras on such date as the State Government may, by notification, appoint.

2. *Amendment of section 2, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 2 of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937 (Madras Act X of 1937) (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), for the words “ the Schedule ” wherever they occur, the word and figure “ Schedule I ” shall be substituted.

3. *Amendment of section 3, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 3 of the principal Act—

(a) in clause (9)—

(i) after the word “ toddy ”, the word “ arrack ” shall be inserted;

(ii) for the words “ methylated spirits ”, the words “ denatured spirits ” shall be substituted;

(iii) the following Explanation shall be added at the end, namely :—

“ *Explanation.*—‘ Denatured ’ means subjected to a process prescribed by the State Government by notification for the purpose of rendering unfit for human consumption ”;

(b) after clause (11), the following clauses shall be inserted, namely :—

“ (11-A) ‘ molasses ’ means the heavy dark coloured “ *mal*
residual syrup drained away in the final stage of the manufacture *ses* ”
of gur or sugar containing, in solution or suspension sugars which
can be fermented and includes any product formed by the addition
to such syrup of any ingredient which does not substantially alter
the character of such syrup; but does not include any article which

[11th March 1958]

the State Government may, by notification, declare not to be molasses, for the purposes of this Act;

“neera or padani” (11-B) ‘ neera or padani ’ means juice drawn from a coconut, palmyra, date or any other kind of palm tree into receptacles treated so as to prevent any fermentation and not fermented : ” ;

(c) . . . for clause (17) . . . the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“ spirits ” (17) ‘ spirits ’ means any alcohol and includes any liquor containing alcohol and obtained by distillation, whether such liquor is, denatured or not;

Explanation.—‘ denatured ’ means subjected to a process prescribed by the State Government by notification for the purpose of rendering unfit for human consumption;

(d) Clause (18) shall be omitted.

[. . .]

4. *Substitution of new section for section 4, Madras Act X of 1937.*—For section 4 of the principal Act, the following section shall be substituted, namely :—

“ 4. *Prohibition of the manufacture of, traffic in, and consumption of, liquor and intoxicating drugs.*—(1) Whoever—

(a) imports, exports, transports or possesses liquor or any intoxicating drug; or

(b) manufactures liquor or any intoxicating drug; or

(c) except in accordance with the rules made by the State Government in that behalf, cultivates the hemp plant (*Cannabis sativa*); or collects any portion of such plant from which an intoxicating drug can be manufactured; or

(d) taps any toddy-producing tree or permits or suffers to be tapped any toddy-producing tree belonging to him or in his possession; or

(e) draws toddy from any tree or permits or suffers toddy to be drawn from any tree belonging to him or in his possession; or

(f) constructs or works any distillery or brewery; or

(g) uses, keeps or has in his possession any materials, still, utensil, implement or apparatus whatsoever for the tapping of toddy or the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug, or keeps or has in his possession any materials which have undergone any process towards the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or from which any liquor or intoxicating drug has been manufactured; or

(h) bottles any liquor for purposes of sale; or

(i) sells liquor or any intoxicating drug; or

(j) consumes or buys liquor or any intoxicating drug;

11th March 1958]

(k) allows any of the acts aforesaid upon premises in his immediate possession, shall be punished—

(i) in the case of an offence falling under clause (b), clause (f), clause (g), clause (h), or clause (i), or an offence falling under clause (k) in so far as it relates to an act specified in any of the clauses aforesaid, with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years and with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees, but in the absence of special and adequate reasons to the contrary to be mentioned in the judgment of the Court, such imprisonment shall not be less than six months and such fine shall not be less than one thousand rupees, in the case of an offence falling under clause (b), clause (f), clause (h) or clause (i) or an offence falling under clause (k) in so far as it relates to an act specified in any of the classes aforesaid;

(ii) in any other case with imprisonment for a term which may extend to one year and with fine which may extend to two thousand rupees, but in the absence of special and adequate reasons to the contrary to be mentioned in the judgment of the Court, such imprisonment shall not be less than three months and such fine shall not be less than five hundred rupees, in the case of the offence of import, export or transport of liquor or any intoxicating drug falling under clause (a) :

Provided that nothing contained in this sub-section shall apply—

(i) to any act done under, and in accordance with the provisions of this Act or the terms of any rules, notification, order, licence or permit issued thereunder; or

(ii) to the possession, sale, purchase, use or consumption of duty-paid medicinal or toilet preparations for their bona fide medicinal or toilet purposes.

(2) It shall be presumed until the contrary is shown—

(a) that a person accused of any offence under clauses (a) to (j) of sub-section (1) has committed such offence in respect of any liquor or intoxicating drug or any still, utensil, implement or apparatus whatsoever for the tapping of toddy or the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or any such materials as are ordinarily used in the tapping of toddy or the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or any materials which have undergone any process towards the manufacture of liquor or any toxicating drug or from which any liquor or intoxicating drug has been manufactured, for the possession of which he is unable to account satisfactorily, and

(b) that a person accused of any offence under clause (k) of sub-section (1) has committed such offence if an offence is proved to have been committed in premises in his immediate possession in respect of any liquor or intoxicating drug or any still, utensil, implement or apparatus whatsoever for the tapping of toddy or the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or any such materials

[11th March 1958]

as are ordinarily used in the tapping of toddy or the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or any materials which have undergone any process towards the manufacture of liquor or any intoxicating drug or from which any liquor or intoxicating drug has been manufactured."

5. Amendment of section 5, Madras Act X of 1937.—In section 5 of the principal Act for the words "with imprisonment which may extend to two years or with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees or with both", the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"with imprisonment for a term which may extend to two years and with fine which may extend to five thousand rupees, but in the absence of special and adequate reasons to the contrary to be mentioned in the judgment of the Court—

(i) such imprisonment shall not be less than six months and such fine shall not be less than seven hundred and fifty rupees for a first offence;

(ii) such imprisonment shall not be less than nine months and such fine shall not be less than one thousand rupees for a second offence; and

(iii) such imprisonment shall not be less than one year and such fine shall not be less than one thousand five hundred rupees for a third and subsequent offences".

6. Amendment of section 6, Madras Act X of 1937.—In section 6 of the principal Act—

(a) the word "commending" shall be omitted; and

(b) for the words "with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees", the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"with imprisonment which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees or with both".

7. Insertion of new section 6-A in Madras Act X of 1937.—After section 6 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely:—

"6-A. *Control and regulation of molasses.*—(1) Except as otherwise provided in sub-sections (2) and (3) no person shall import, export, transport, sell or have in his possession any quantity of molasses.

(2) The State Government may, by general or special order, authorise any officer to grant licences for the import, export, sale or possession of molasses.

(3) The State Government may also authorise any officer to grant permits for the transport of molasses."

11th March 1958]

8. *Amendment of section 11, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 11 of the principal Act, for the words “with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees”, the following shall be substituted, namely :—

“with imprisonment which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees or with both”.

9. *Amendment of section 14, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 14 of the principal Act, sub-section (2) shall be renumbered as sub-section (3) and the following shall be inserted as sub-section (2), namely :—

“(2) Where during the trial of a case for an offence against this Act, the Court decides that anything is liable to confiscation under sub-section (1), the Court may, after hearing the person, if any, claiming any right thereto and the evidence, if any, which he produces in support of his claim, order the confiscation :

Provided that no animal, vessel, cart or other vehicle shall be confiscated, if the owner thereof satisfies the Court that he had exercised due care in preventing the commission of the offence.”

10. *Insertion of new sections 15-A, 15-B and 15-C in Madras Act X of 1937.*—After section 15 of the principal Act, the following sections shall be inserted in Chapter II, namely :—

“15-A. *Summary trial of certain offences.*—Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), the State Government may confer on—

(i) any Magistrate of the first class, or

(ii) any Magistrate of the second class who has exercised the powers of such Magistrate for not less than one year, or

(iii) any Special Magistrate appointed under section 14 of the said Code upon whom the powers conferred by section 32 of the said Code on a Magistrate of the first class have been conferred, or

(iv) any Special Magistrate appointed under section 14 of the said Code upon whom the powers conferred by section 32 of the said Code on a Magistrate of the second class have been conferred and who has exercised those powers for not less than one year,

power to try summarily in accordance with the provisions contained in sections 262 to 265 of the said Code, all or any of the offences which are punishable under this Act with imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months, or with fine, or with both, but as a result of such trial no sentence except a sentence of fine shall be imposed.

15-B. *Enhanced jurisdiction of Magistrates and Special Magistrates.*—Notwithstanding anything contained in section 32 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), it shall be lawful for the Magistrates specified in column (1) of

[11th March 1958]

the Table below to exercise the powers specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof, in respect of offences punishable under this Act.

TABLE.

(1)	(2)
Magistrates of the first class or Special Magistrates appointed under section 14 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), upon whom the powers conferred by section 32 of the said Code on a Magistrate of the first class have been conferred.	Fine exceeding two thousand rupees but not exceeding five thousand rupees.
Magistrates of the second class or Special Magistrates appointed under section 14 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), upon whom the powers conferred by section 32 of the said Code on a Magistrate of the second class have been conferred.	Imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year Fine not exceeding one thousand rupees.

15-C. *Certain offences to be non-bailable.*—(1) The offences specified in sub-section (2) shall be non-bailable and the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), with respect of non-bailable offences shall apply to those offences.

(2) The offences referred to in sub-section (1) are—

(a) offences of import, export or transport of liquor or any intoxicating drug under clause (a) of section 4 (1) and offences under clauses (b), (f), (h) and (i) of section 4 (1) and under clause (k) of that section in so far as it relates to an act specified in any of those clauses; and

(b) offences under section 5.

(3) Nothing contained in sections 27, 28, 29, 32, 38 and 39 shall be construed as enabling a person to be admitted to bail if the offence alleged to have been committed by such person is one referred to in sub-section (2)."

11. *Amendment of section 19, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 19 of the principal Act—

(i) in clause (a), for the words "sweet toddy", the words "neera or padani" shall be substituted; and

(ii) in clause (b), for the word "toddy", the words "neera or padani" shall be substituted.

12. *Amendment of sections 21 and 22, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In sections 21 and 22 of the principal Act, for the word and figures "section 18" the word, figures and letter "section 6-A, 18" shall be substituted.

13. *Amendment of section 23, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 23 of the principal Act, for sub-section (2), the following sub-sections shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2) The State Government may cancel or suspend any such licence or permit for any of the aforesaid reasons.

(3) Before any licence or permit is cancelled or suspended under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) the holder of the licence

11th March 1958]

or permit shall be given an opportunity to state his objections within a reasonable time, not ordinarily exceeding fourteen days, and any representation made by him in this behalf shall be duly taken into consideration before final orders are passed."

14. *Substitution of new section for section 26, Madras Act X of 1937.*—For section 26 of the principal Act, the following section shall be substituted, namely :—

" 26. *Prohibition committees.*—(1) The State Government may, for the whole of the State of Madras and the Collector of a district may, for such area in the district as the State Government may, by general or special order, determine in this behalf, constitute prohibition committees to assist them or him in carrying out the objects of this Act.

(2) Every member of a prohibition committee shall observe the working of this Act and report thereon and on every matter connected therewith at the prescribed intervals and at any other time he thinks fit, to the State Government in case he is a member of the prohibition committee constituted by the State Government, and to the Collector in case he is a member of the prohibition committee constituted by the Collector.

(3) Every member of a prohibition committee shall be entitled to give information at any police station regarding the commission or suspected commission of any offence against this Act in the area of the committee concerned, and the officer in charge of such station shall take action on such information and investigate the case in the manner laid down in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898)."

15. *Amendment of section 30, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 30, clause (c), of the principal Act, the words, figure and letter " section 4-A or " shall be omitted.

16. *Amendment of section 32, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 32 of the principal Act—

(i) in clause (a), the word, figure and letter " section 4-A " shall be omitted ;

(ii) the following shall be added at the end, namely :—

" Provided further that where any toddy or wash or any sonti soru is seized under this section by any officer or person, such officer or person may destroy or cause to be destroyed on the spot, the toddy, wash or sonti soru and send the pots or other receptacles in which the toddy, wash or sonti soru was kept to the Police or Prohibition Officer or Magistrate having jurisdiction to inquire into the case, with a report attested by two or more witnesses specifying the quantity of toddy, wash or sonti soru seized and destroyed, and the number of pots and other receptacles sent.

[11th March 1958]

Explanation.—For the purposes of this section,—

‘sonti soru’ means a liquid prepared from rice or starch which is in the process of vinous or alcoholic fermentation or in which such fermentation has ceased; and

‘wash’ means a mixture of water and saccharine materials which is in the process of vinous or alcoholic fermentation or in which such fermentation has ceased”.

[. . .]

17. *Insertion of new section 41-A in Madras Act X of 1937.*—After section 41 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely :—

“41-A. *Obtaining of medical certificates in the case of persons found in a state of intoxication.*—(1) Any officer authorized to arrest a person for an offence punishable under section 4 (1) (j) in so far as it relates to consumption of liquor or any intoxicating drug who has reason to believe that any person has consumed liquor or any intoxicating drug, may produce such person for examination, before any medical officer authorized by the State Government and request the medical officer to furnish a certificate on his finding whether such person has consumed any liquor or intoxicating drug or is in a state of intoxication or not.

(2) Any medical officer before whom such person is produced shall be bound to examine such person and furnish to the officer by whom such person has been produced a certificate as to the state of such person, and if any form has been prescribed for the purpose, in such form.

(3) If the person produced is a woman, the examination shall be carried out by a woman medical officer authorized by the State Government.

(4) Any person who has been produced before a medical officer in pursuance of this section shall allow himself to be examined by the medical officer.

(5) If any person who under this section is required to undergo medical examination resists or refuses to allow himself to be produced before or to be examined by the medical officer, it shall be lawful to use all means necessary to secure the production and examination of such person.

(6) Resistance to production or refusal to allow examination under this section shall be deemed to be an offence under section 186 of the Indian Penal Code (Central Act XLV of 1860).

(7) In trials under this Act, it may be presumed, unless and until the contrary is proved, that the accused has committed an offence under section 4 (1) (j), if he having been produced before a medical officer under this section had resisted or had refused to allow himself to be examined by such medical officer.

(8) Any document purporting to be a certificate signed by a medical officer authorized by the State Government may be used

11th March 1958]

as evidence of the facts stated therein in any proceeding under this Act or under sections 272 to 276 of the Indian Penal Code (Central Act XLV of 1860), but the Court may at the instance of the accused order the attendance for cross-examination of the medical officer who issued the certificate."

18. *Insertion of new sections 52-A, 52-B, 52-C and 52-D in Madras Act X of 1937.*—After section 52 of the principal Act, the following sections shall be inserted, namely :—

"52-A. *Security for abstaining from commission of certain offences.*—(1) Whenever any person is convicted of an offence punishable under clause (b) or clause (d) or clause (e) or clause (i) of section 4 (1) and the Court convicting him is of opinion that such person habitually commits or attempts to commit, or abets the commission of any such offence and that it is necessary to require such person to execute a bond for abstaining from the commission of any such offence, the Court may, at the time of passing sentence on such person, order him to execute a bond for a sum proportionate to his means, with or without sureties, for abstaining from the commission of such offence during such period, not exceeding three years, as it thinks fit to fix.

(2) The bond shall be in the form contained in Schedule II, and the provisions of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), shall in so far as they are applicable, apply to all matters connected with such bond as if it were a bond to keep the peace ordered to be executed under section 106 of that Code.

(3) If the conviction is set aside on appeal or otherwise, the bond so executed shall become void.

(4) An order under this section may also be made by an Appellate Court or by the High Court when exercising its powers of revision.

52-B. *Power to release certain offenders on probation of good conduct.*—(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), or the Madras Probation of Offenders Act, 1936 (Madras Act III of 1937), when any person is found guilty of—

(a) any offence punishable under section 4-A, 6, 11 or 24, or

(b) the commission, attempt to commit, or abetment of the commission of, any of the acts making up any such offence as is referred to in clause (a), when such commission, attempt or abetment is punishable under section 12, or

(c) any breach of any of the conditions subject to which the exemption under section 16 or 17-A is notified, and no previous conviction for any offence under this Act is proved against him, the Court by which he is found guilty may, instead of sentencing

[11th March 1958]

him at once to any punishment release him on his entering into a bond, with at least one surety to appear and receive sentence when called upon at any time during such period not exceeding five years as the Court may direct and in the meantime to abstain from committing any offence under this Act :

Provided that the Court shall not direct the release of an offender under this section, unless it is satisfied that the offender or his surety or one of his sureties has a fixed place of abode or regular occupation in the place for which the Court acts or in which the offender is likely to live during the period named for the observance of the conditions.

(2) Where the offender referred to in sub-section (1) is under twenty-four years of age, the Court may make a supervision order directing that such offender shall be under the supervision of such probation officer appointed under the Madras Probation of Offenders Act, 1936 (Madras Act III of 1937), as may be named in the order during the period specified therein and imposing such other conditions for securing such supervision as may be specified in the order :

Provided that the period so specified shall not extend beyond the date on which, in the opinion of the Court, the offender will attain the age of twenty-five years.

(3) A Court making a supervision order under sub-section (2) shall require the offender, before he is released, to enter into a bond, with at least one surety, to observe the conditions specified in such order and such additional conditions with respect to residence, abstention from intoxicants and any other matters as the Court may, having regard to the particular circumstances of the case, consider fit to impose for preventing a commission of any offence under this Act by the offender.

(4) A Court making a supervision order shall furnish to the offender and the surety or sureties a notice in writing stating in simple terms the conditions of the bond.

(5) An order under this section may be made by any Appellate Court or by the High Court when exercising its powers of revision.

52-C. Procedure in case of offender failing to observe conditions of bond.—(1) If the Court before which the offender is bound by his bond under section 52-B to appear for sentence when called upon, or any Court which could have dealt with the offender in respect of his original offence, has reason to believe that the offender has failed to observe any of the conditions of the bond executed by him, it may issue a warrant for his apprehension, or may, if it thinks fit, issue a summons to the offender and his surety or sureties requiring him or them to attend before it at such time as may be specified in the summons.

11th March 1958]

(2) The Court before which the offender is so brought or appears may either remand him to custody until the case is concluded, or admit him to bail with at least one surety, to appear on the date of hearing.

(3) If the Court after hearing the case is satisfied that the offender has failed to observe any of the conditions of the bond executed by him, it may forthwith sentence him for the original offence.

(4) An order under this section may be made any Appellate Court or by the High Court when exercising its powers of revision.

52-D. *Provision as to bonds.*—The provisions of sections 122, 126, 126-A, 406-A (b) and (c), 514, 514-A, 514-B, and 515 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898 (Central Act V of 1898), shall so far as may be, apply in the case of sureties given under this Act."

19. *Amendment of section 53, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 53 of the principal Act, for the words " Nothing contained in this Act ", the words " Save as expressly provided in this Act, nothing contained therein " shall be substituted.

20. *Amendment of section 54, Madras Act X of 1937.*—In section 54 of the principal Act—

(a) in sub-section (2)—

(i) in clause (k), the word " and " at the end shall be omitted; and

(ii) after clause (l), the following clauses shall be added, namely :—

" (m) for the prevention of the use of medicinal or toilet preparations for any purpose other than medicinal or toilet purposes and for the regulation of the use of any liquor or drug exempted from all or any of the provisions of this Act;

(n) for the proper collection of duty on all kinds of liquor or drugs;

(o) for all matters expressly required or allowed by this Act to be prescribed.";

(b) after sub-section (2), the following sub-section shall be added, namely :—

" (3) All rules made under this Act shall, as soon as possible after they are made, be placed on the table of both the Houses of the Legislature and shall be subject to such modifications by way of amendments or repeal as the Legislative Assembly may make within fourteen days on which the House actually sits either in the same session or no more than one session."

[11th March 1958]

21. *Addition of Schedule II in Madras Act X of 1937.*—The schedule to the principal Act shall be numbered as Schedule I and after the Schedule as so numbered, the following Schedule shall be added, namely :—

“ SCHEDULE II.

BOND TO ABSTAIN FROM THE COMMISSION OF OFFENCES
UNDER THE MADRAS PROHIBITION ACT, 1937.

(See section 52-A.)

Whereas I, _____ (name), inhabitant of _____ (place), have been called upon to enter into a bond to abstain from the commission of any offence under sections 4 (1) (b), 4 (1) (d), 4 (1) (e) and 4 (1) (i) of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937, for the term of _____, I hereby bind myself not to commit any such offence during the said term and, in case of my making default therein, I hereby bind myself to forfeit to State of Madras, the sum of rupees _____

Dated this, _____ day of _____ 19 .

(Signature) _____,

Where a bond with sureties is to be executed, add—

We do hereby declare ourselves sureties for the abovenamed _____ that he will abstain from the commission of any offence under sections 4 (1) (b), 4 (1) (d), 4 (1) (e), 4 (1) (i), of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937, during the said term, and in case of his making default therein, we bind ourselves, jointly and severally, to forfeit to the State or Madras, the sum of rupees _____

Dated this, _____ day of _____ 19 .

(Signed) _____ ”.

T. HANUMANTHAPPA,
Secretary.

FORT ST. GEORGE, MADRAS,
8th February 1958.

APPENDIX.

DISSENTING MINUTES.

I

I am submitting hereunder a Note of Dissent to the Report of the Joint Select Committee on the above Bill (Bill further to amend the Madras Prohibition Act of 1937);

11th March 1958]

The Bill is supposed to provide for the strict enforcement of the Madras Prohibition Act of 1937.

Prohibition is a social reform measure; and the success of any social reform measure depends on its inherent moral strength, popular support and the social environment. The main Act itself is lacking in these pre-requisites.

For, the moral strength of the Act is reduced by the discriminating provision that some persons can drink liquor by obtaining permits. The Act has failed to get necessary popular support as adequate propaganda is not being done and as the approach to Prohibition is bureaucratic. The social environment is not helpful, because rural unemployment is becoming more and more acute, thanks to the reactionary and short-sighted policies of the Government. Even all the former toddy-tappers have not been provided with remunerative employment.

The Government does not seem to have realized these fundamental defects and drawbacks in the enforcement of Prohibition in the State; for the amending Bill does not seek even to remove the provision to issue liquor permits.

Further, in the name of effective enforcement of the Act, sections 4 and 5 of the Amending Bill prescribe a minimum period of imprisonment and a minimum amount of fine. This is something unheard of in legal history. It is contended that the Prohibition Act of Bombay contains such a provision. But I submit it is not an example to follow. For such a provision is not only unjust on the face of it, but in effect encroaching upon the curtailing the independence of the Judiciary, and therefore polluting the "purity of justice". Hence those provisions in the Amendment Bill which seek to prescribe a minimum punishment should be deleted.

MADRAS,

8th March 1958.

P. S. CHINNADURAI.

II

The object of this Bill is to provide for more severe penalties for infringement of the provisions of the Madras Prohibition Act. The principal Act was passed so long ago as 1937 and in the assessment of the result of the enforcement of the provisions of this Act, divergent opinions are held. The Ramamurthy Committee appointed a few years ago by the Andra Government reported that Prohibition has ceased to prohibit and it is a failure. The findings of this Committee might well apply to the Madras State. There are people who believe that Prohibition has only resulted in a cottage industry for illicit distillation and demoralization of the public and that the addicts are still addicts and while they used to drink in pules open to the public they now drink at home and with them women and children also drink and they drink unhealthy stuff. Those who are supporters of the Prohibition law

[11th March 1958]

feel that Prohibition has done good to many poor families and money is not wasted in drink but is spent on the purchase of amenities of the members of the family.

While I do not question the sincerity with which protogenists of Prohibition and their opponents express their views, I think that Prohibition has done some good, but it has also done great harm. If the balance-sheet is struck, I believe it has done more harm than good and it is high time that an assessment of the results of Prohibition should be made by a High Power Committee and their recommendations consider by the Legislature. The Government, however, is not in a mood to appoint this High Power Committee and has introduced this Bill, which provides for more severe penalties for infringement of law.

It is fundamental principal that the Government cannot create virtue by legislation. If the Government provide by law that people shall not do something which they like to do, the law may be disobeyed and it will only result in demoralization. Prohibition, in my opinion, should depend for its success upon public opinion and not on any statute passed by the Legislature. We may not place the cart before the horse.

We must always make a distinction between drinking and drunkardness. Drinking is likely to lead to drunkardness in a few cases but freedom to drink will prevent excesses and therefore drunkenness in many.

One fact to be remembered is that Prohibition has been tried in a few countries in the world and failure has been recorded. It is necessary to note that there are in existence efficient Governments all over the world and also legislative bodies to whom these Governments are responsible. In advanced countries like the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France and other countries in Western Europe, Soviet Russia, China, Japan and other countries, there is no Prohibition. Are not the Governments and Legislatures in these countries concerned with the welfare and health of their people? In our own country, there is no Prohibition in many important pockets, such as Delhi, the capital of the country and coming near to our own State, in Hyderabad, Bangalore, Ernakulam and other cities. Prohibition, if it is to be successful, must be an all-India effort.

If drinking is an evil and is unhealthy, the fighting forces of the country should not be allowed to drink, but they are exempted by the Act. Consistency is not in evidence in the enforcement of Prohibition.

I think the best course to adopt, which will serve the object of protogenists of Prohibition and the opponents thereof, is to dilute drinks like toddy, etc., to such an extent that any amount of drinking would not make a man drunk. This is what is done in Britain, Germany and other countries. Labour classes in these countries enjoy a glass or two of beer. The cost of this drink is kept at a

11th March 1958]

minimum and nobody gets drunk on many glasses of beer for the reason the drink is diluted. This drink may be rationed. I strongly plead for the adoption of this method instead of total Prohibition. Total Prohibition will never be a success.

Coming to the Provisions of the Bill, I am totally opposed to the more regressive enforcement of the Prohibition law.

What is required is the creation of public opinion and a body of persons believing in Prohibition should generate that public opinion and salvage addicts from drink. I am glad the Select Committee has agreed to the constitution of a Central Committee for the State to implement the ideology of Prohibition.

The Legislature takes a very great responsibility in placing in the Statute provisions which will infringe the liberty of the individual and which will be disobeyed by the public. The liberty of the individual should not be touched unless it is inconsistent with the security of the State or for the good of the individual. What is good for the individual is for the individual himself to judge except in extreme cases. The rigour of the law should be reduced if Prohibition is to be successful, it is idle for the Proponent to say that Prohibition has been successful, but requires more stringent enforcement. The plain fact is that Prohibition is a failure, and proponents do not want any investigation on the question whether it has been a success or a failure and they want to introduce more stringent provisions for enforcing prohibition. These are objectionable from the point of view of the individual and from the point of view of demoralisation of the public, who will try to evade laws which are too stringent. This Bill may further contribute to the failure of Prohibition than to its success.

It is a pity that our own experience and that in other countries have no effect on us. Perhaps the American writer is right when he said that history teaches us one thing and one thing only and that is it teaches us nothing.

I plead for the constitution of a High Power Committee to assess the effect of Prohibition for the last twenty years and more. I plead for partial Prohibition. I plead for an All-India effort on Prohibition. I plead for decreasing instead of increasing penal provisions in the enforcement of the law of Prohibition.

MADRAS,

V. K. JOHN.

8th March 1958.

III

There could be no two opinion about the need to put down the evil of drinking. The Prohibition Act has been in force for a considerable length of time in our State and also in some other States in our country. We also hear of this kind of experiment in

[11th March 1958]

other countries. Based on these experiments, the correct lesson to draw is, that this is not an objective which could be achieved by stringent repressive measures or by efficient administration.

Basically the problem of drinking is social and economic one and should be tackled as such. To the extent the cultural and economic level of the masses is raised, to that extent alone the object of Prohibition could be achieved. True, Prohibition offences are on the increase. It is not due to want of severity in our Prohibition laws.

In the name of enforcing Prohibition laws, there has been excesses by the Police.

Sufficient efforts were not taken to redress the grievances of the ex-toddy tappers and measures for rehabilitating the ex-toddy tappers and ex-addicts have been far from adequate. Rural unemployment is on the increase.

The success of the Prohibition policy would depend more on the tackling of the above problems, rather than giving more powers to the Police, who are already being accused of excesses.

Further, the steps taken by the Government to educate the masses is very weak and ineffective. The consciousness of the people should be raised through persuasion and proper education.

The way in which the already existing provisions of the Prohibition law were enforced, has only resulted in creating a sort of apathy if not antagonism among the people.

In this background, the attempt to give more powers to the Police and to make the punishment more stringent, would result in creating further resistance from the people and thus endanger the popular appeal of Prohibition policy.

MADRAS,

N. K. PALANISAMI.

8th March 1958.